IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 5481 of 1993
With
CIVIL APPLICATION NOS.784 & 2111 OF 1994

HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.S.JHAVERI

==========

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : NO

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the concerned Magistrate/Magistrates,Judge/Judges,Tribunal/Tribunals? : NO

DL THANKI

Versus

STATE OF GUJARAT

Appearance:
MR HJ NANAVATI for Petitioner No. 1
MR LB DABI, AGP, for Respondent No. 1-3

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.S.JHAVERI

Date of decision: 29/06/2004

ORAL JUDGEMENT

1. In this petition the petitioner has prayed for a direction to the respondents to regularise the service of the petitioner in the cadre of Lectures/Assistant Lectures in the Government Polytechnic and other consequential directions.

2. Mr. HJ Nanavati, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is in service and he is regularly working on the post. He further submitted that the petitioner had made a representation to the respondent authority on 11th March 1993, which is also stated in the petition. He further submitted that the said representation is not decided. Mr. L.B. Dabi, learned AGP, states that the said representation will be decided as may be directed by this Court.

3. In view of the above facts and circumstances, interest of justice would be met if the respondent is directed to decide the representation of the petitioner. Accordingly the petitioner shall make a representation to the respondent no.2 within a period of one week from today and the respondent no.2 shall consider and decide the said representation within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of the said representation.

4. With the above observation and direction the petition is disposed of. Rule is discharged with no order as to costs.

5. Since the main petition has been disposed of, Civil Application Nos.784 and 2111 of 1994 will not survive and are accordingly disposed of.

[K.S. JHAVERI, J.]
ar